

Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at Loyola Marymount University

Professional Services Division

March 25, 2003

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the Accreditation Team visit conducted at Loyola Marymount University. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation is made for the institution.

Accreditation Recommendations

- (1) The Team recommends that, based on the attached Accreditation Team Report, the Committee on Accreditation make the following accreditation decision for Loyola Marymount University and all of its credential programs: **ACCREDITATION**

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

- Administrative Services Credential
 - Preliminary
 - Preliminary Internship
 - Professional
- Education Specialist Credentials – Preliminary Level I and Professional Level II
 - Preliminary Level I
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internship
 - Professional Level II
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
- Multiple Subject Credential
 - Multiple Subject
 - BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)
 - Multiple Subject Internship
- Pupil Personnel Services Credential
 - School Counseling
 - School Psychology
 - School Psychology Internship

- Reading Certificate
- Single Subject Credential
Single Subject Credential
BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)
Single Subject Internship

(2) Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted
- Loyola Marymount University be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Loyola Marymount University be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2007-2008 academic year subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation visits by both the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Background Information

Loyola Marymount University (LMU) is a private Catholic university located in Los Angeles. The current university is a result of the 1973 merging of the Jesuit-sponsored Loyola University of Los Angeles (founded in 1911) and Marymount-sponsored Marymount College of Los Angeles, (founded in 1932). Building on the shared emphases of education and social justice, the mission of LMU is the encouragement of learning, the education of the whole person, the service of faith, and the promotion of justice. Guided by the University's mission, LMU strives to achieve the following goals:

- Promote academic excellence,
- Live an institutional commitment to Roman Catholicism and the Judeo-Christian tradition,
- Provide a liberal education,
- Foster a student-centered university,
- Create a sense of community on campus, and
- Participate in the life of the larger community.

LMU serves the Los Angeles area, a region characterized by great diversity in ethnicity, language, religion, and socioeconomic levels. The LMU student body includes 8214 total students with 65% classified as undergraduate, 18% graduate, and 17 % law students. Forty-nine percent of the students are white, and Hispanic Americans make up the next largest ethnic group with 16% of the total population, followed closely by Asian/Pacific Islander at 12%. The student body includes diversity of religious backgrounds. While 58% of the undergraduates and 41% of the graduates are Roman Catholic, students from various Protestant denominations as well as Jewish and Buddhist backgrounds are represented. Seventy-eight percent of LMU undergraduates are from California; at the graduate level, 82%. International students make up 2% of the undergraduate population and 6% of the graduate. Countries of origin include India, Philippines, France, United Kingdom, Nigeria, Mexico and various other countries.

The LMU governance structure includes six academic units reporting to the academic vice president: College of Liberal Arts, College of Business Administration, College of Communication and Fine Arts, College of Science and Engineering, School of Film and TV, and the School of Education (SOE). (The Dean of the School of Law reports directly to the President.) Content preparation for liberal studies, English, social sciences, and modern languages rests in the College of Liberal Arts. Mathematics and sciences are the responsibility of the College of Science and Engineering, while the College of Communication and Fine Arts houses art and a proposed dance program set to begin Fall 03. The School of Education oversees the pedagogical knowledge and experiences for all undergraduate and graduate teaching and professional service programs. The School also serves Teach for America (TFA) candidates and interns working to gain their permanent credentials and works in partnership with under-resourced Catholic schools in Los Angeles County (Partners in Los Angeles Catholic Education – PLACE).

The School of Education is headed by a Dean who is responsible for its overall administration and operation of all teacher education programs at LMU. He is assisted by an associate dean. The School is further divided into two divisions: professional services and teacher education. All candidates seeking certification must meet the requirements of the School of Education. At the initial level, the elementary program (multiple subject credential) has the largest enrollment. Approximately 40 % of the 150-170 total credential recommendations are for elementary candidates. At the advanced level, the school counseling program is the largest program. The majority of LMU teacher education candidates are post-baccalaureate with 215 undergraduates and 659 post-baccalaureate/graduate students. All programs are administrated through the LMU main campus.

Merged COA and NCATE Visit

This was an continuing accreditation visit by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The visit merged the accreditation processes of the Committee on Accreditation (COA) and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) according to the approved protocol. The Accreditation Team, which included membership from the COA and NCATE, received a single Institutional Self-Study Report, worked from a common interview schedule, and collaborated on all decisions related to accreditation standards.

The merged visit was based upon the partnership agreement reached between the COA and NCATE. The first partnership agreement was developed and signed in 1989. The Partnership was revised and renewed in 1996 and subsequently revised and renewed in 2001. The Partnership Agreement requires that all California universities who are NCATE accredited participate in reviews that are merged with the State's accreditation process. The agreement allows the university the option to respond to the NCATE 2000 Standards, provided that the Commission's Common Standards are addressed in the context of that response. It also allows the subsequent accreditation team report to be written based upon those standards. Loyola Marymount University exercised that option. In addition, the institution must respond to all appropriate Program Standards. The agreement also states that the teams will be merged, will share common information and interview schedules, and will collect data and reach conclusions about the quality of the programs in a collaborative manner. However, the accreditation team

will take the common data collected by the team and adapt it according to the needs of the respective accrediting bodies. This is because the NCATE Unit Accreditation Board needs a report that uses the familiar language and format of the NCATE standards rather than the language that is needed for the COA (i.e., information about Common Standards and Program Standards.) As with the previous partnership agreements, universities are not required to submit Folios to the NCATE-affiliated professional associations if they are part of a state partnership.

Preparation for the Accreditation Visit

The Commission staff consultant, Beth Graybill, was originally assigned to the institution in September 2000 and met with institutional leadership initially shortly after that time. Over the next two years, there were two consultant meetings with faculty, program directors and institutional administration. The meetings led to decisions about team size, team configuration, standards to be used, format for the institutional self-study report, interview schedule, logistical and organizational arrangements. In addition, telephone, e-mail and regular mail communication was maintained between the staff consultant and institutional representatives. The Team Leader (Co-chair for the visit), Dr. Lamar Mayer, was selected in May 2002. The Chair of the NCATE Board of Examiners (Co-chair for the visit), Dr. Pamela Fly, was assigned in November, 2002. The team size agreement was signed on September 6, 2002. On February 19, 2003, the team co-chairs and the staff consultant met with the representatives of Loyola Marymount to make final determinations about the interview schedule, the template for the visit and any remaining organizational details. Because of a change in CCTC staffing in early March, Lawrence Birch was assigned to be the lead consultant for the visit.

Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report

The Institutional Self-Study Report was prepared beginning with responses to the NCATE unit standards and appropriate references to the California Common Standards. This was followed by separate responses to the Program Standards. For each program area, the institution decided which of the five options in the *Accreditation Framework* would be used for responses to the Program Standards. Institutional personnel decided to respond using Option One, California Program Standards, for all program areas.

Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team

Decisions about the structure and size of the team were made cooperatively between the Dean and Faculty of the School of Education and the Commission Consultant. It was agreed that there would be a team of fifteen consisting of a Team Leader, a Common Standards Cluster that would include four NCATE members and two COA members, a Basic Credential Cluster of five members, and a Services Credential Cluster of three members. The Dean and Consultant assigned each credential program to one of the program clusters. The Commission Consultant then selected the team members to participate in the review. Team members were selected because of their expertise,

experience and adaptability, and training in the use of the *Accreditation Framework* and experience in merged accreditation visits.

The COA Team Leader and the Chair of the NCATE Board of Examiners served as Co-Chairs of the visit. Each member of the COA/NCATE Common Standards Cluster examined primarily the University's responses to the NCATE Standards/Common Standards but also considered the Program Standards for each credential area. Members of the Basic, Specialist and Services Clusters primarily evaluated the institution's responses to the Program Standards for their respective areas but also considered unit issues.

Intensive Evaluation of Program Data

Prior to the accreditation visit, team members received copies of the appropriate institutional reports and information from Commission staff on how to prepare for the visit. The on-site phase of the review began on Saturday, March 22. The Team Leader and the two COA members of the Common Standards Cluster and CCTC staff arrived on Saturday afternoon and began their deliberations with the four NCATE team members. It included orientation to the accreditation procedures and organizational arrangements for both the COA and NCATE team members. On Sunday morning, March 23, the Common Standards Cluster examined documents on the campus. The remainder of the team arrived on Sunday afternoon with a meeting of the entire team followed by organizational meetings of the clusters. The institution sponsored a working dinner on Sunday evening to provide an orientation to the institution.

On Monday and Tuesday, March 24 and 25, the team collected data from interviews and reviewed institutional documents according to procedures outlined in the *Accreditation Handbook*. There was extensive consultation among the members of all clusters, and much sharing of information. Lunch on Monday and Tuesday was spent sharing data that had been gathered from interviews and document review. The entire team met on Monday evening to discuss progress the first day and share information about findings. On Tuesday morning, the team Co-chairs met with institutional leadership for a mid-visit status report. This provided an opportunity to identify areas in which the team had concerns and for which additional information was being sought. Tuesday evening and Wednesday morning were set aside for additional team meetings and the writing of the team report. During those work sessions, cluster members shared and checked their data with members of other clusters and particularly with the Common Standards Cluster, since the NCATE/Common Standards findings also affected each of the Program Clusters.

Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

Pursuant to the *Accreditation Framework*, and the *Accreditation Handbook*, the team prepared a report using a narrative format. For each of the NCATE/Common Standards, the team made a decision of "Standard Met" or "Standard Not Met." The team had the option of deciding that some of the standards were "Met Minimally" with either Quantitative or Qualitative Concerns. The team then wrote specific narrative comments about each standard providing a finding or rationale for its decision and then

noted particular Strengths beyond the narrative supporting the findings on the standards and Concerns beyond the narrative supporting the findings on the standard.

For each separate program area, the team prepared a narrative report about the program standards pointing out any standards that were not met or not fully met and included explanatory information about findings related to the program standards. The team noted particular Strengths beyond the narrative supporting the findings on the standards and Concerns not rising to the level of finding a standard less than fully met.

The team included some "Professional Comments" at the end of the report for consideration by the institution. These comments are to be considered as consultative advice from the team members, but are not binding of the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.

Accreditation Decisions by the Team

The team discussed its findings on Tuesday evening and made decisions about each standard and a tentative accreditation decision. On Wednesday morning the team reviewed the draft report and confirmed its earlier decisions about the results of the visit. The team discussed each NCATE/Common Standard and decided that all standards were fully met for purposes of the NCATE report with two areas of improvement identified. The team then determined that two standards were "Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns" for purposes of the state report. These two standards corresponded with the areas identified for improvement. The team then specifically discussed each program area and decided that all Program Standards were fully met, with the exception of two standards across three program areas. The strengths and concerns related to each credential program were also reviewed. One standard for the Multiple and Single Subject programs was "Met with Concerns" and one standard in the School Counseling program was "Met Minimally." Even though there were four standards less than fully met and some concerns were identified, the team determined that there were numerous compensating strengths both institution-wide and in all program areas. The team concluded that all credential programs were strong, effective and of high quality.

The team made its accreditation recommendation based on its findings and the policies set forth in the *Accreditation Handbook*. The team decided on an accreditation recommendation for the institution. The options were: "Accreditation," "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations," "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations," "Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations," or "Denial of Accreditation." After thorough discussion, the entire team voted to recommend the status of "**Accreditation.**" The recommendation for "Accreditation" was based on the unanimous agreement of the team and that the overall evidence clearly supported the accreditation recommendation

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION
ACCREDITATION TEAM REPORT**

INSTITUTION: Loyola Marymount University

DATES OF VISIT: March 22-26, 2003

**ACCREDITATION TEAM
RECOMMENDATION:** ACCREDITATION

RATIONALE:

The recommendation pertaining to the accreditation status of Loyola Marymount University and all of its credential programs was determined according to the following:

NCATE's INSTITUTIONAL REPORT (IR) WHICH INCLUDED:

- The Institutional Overview
- Mission and Goal Statements
- Conceptual Framework
- Responses to the "NCATE 6" Standards

The University elected to use the NCATE format and to write to the NCATE Unit Standards. Information from the COA Common Standards was included in the NCATE format. The corresponding part of this report also utilizes the NCATE standards and format. The total team (NCATE and COA members) reviewed each element of the NCATE Standards (with the addition of appropriate additional information from the COA Common Standards) and voted as to whether each standard was met, not met, or met with areas of needed improvement (for the NCATE report); or met, met minimally with qualitative or quantitative concerns, or does not meet the standard (for the COA report).

PROGRAM STANDARDS::

The University prepared responses to program standards in the following documents:

- Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs (S.B. 2042 Standards)
- Education Specialist Program (Mild/Moderate)
- Pupil Services: School Counseling Program
- Pupil Services: School Psychology Program
- Administrative Services Program

The Review Team was organized into clusters as follows::

- The NCATE/Common Standards Cluster
- The Basic Teacher Credential Programs Cluster
- The Service Credential Programs Cluster

The Program Clusters reviewed each standard and program element (with assistance from the NCATE/Common Standards Cluster) and all members voted on whether the standards were met, met minimally with qualitative or quantitative concerns, or does not meet the standard.

Team members reviewed the self-study documents, conducted numerous interviews, and reviewed extensive collections of evidence/documentation in the documents room.

ACCREDITATION RECOMMENDATION: The decision to recommend Accreditation was based on team consensus that the six (6) NCATE Standards were met with identified areas for improvement in two standards for purposes of the NCATE report. For COA purposes, two standards were met minimally with qualitative concerns related to the NCATE areas for improvement. All elements of the eight (8) COA Common Standards were addressed within the context of the NCATE report. All Program Standards were fully met with the exception of Standard 16 in the Multiple and Single Subject programs (Met with Concerns) and Standard 24 in the Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling program (Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns).

The following report further explains these findings and recommendations.

State Team Leader: **Lamar Mayer** (Team Co-Chair)
California State University, Los Angeles

Common Standards Cluster:

Pamela Fly, Cluster Leader, NCATE Chair (Team Co-Chair)
University of Central Oklahoma

Sam Guerriero (NCATE Member)
Butler University, Indiana

Susan R. Rokow (NCATE Member)
Beachwood City Schools, Ohio

Viviana L. Lopez (NCATE Member)
Pershing Elementary School (Texas)

John Nagle (CCTC/COA Member)
University of the Pacific

Jim Reidt (CCTC/COA Member)
San Juan Unified School District

Basic Credential Cluster:

Reyes Quezada, Cluster Leader
University of San Diego

Gary Kinsey
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Wanda Baral
Ocean View Elementary School District

Beth Bythrow
Los Angeles Unified School District

Robert Jorden
San Diego County Office of Education (retired)

Services Credential Cluster:

Jo Birdsell, Cluster Leader
Point Loma Nazarene University

Cathy Turney
West Covina Unified School District

Barbara Sorenson
Azusa Pacific University

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

University Catalog
 Institutional Self Study
 Course Syllabi
 Candidate Files
 Fieldwork Handbooks
 Follow-up Survey Results
 Needs Analysis Results
 Information Booklets
 Field Experience Notebooks
 Schedule of Classes
 Advisement Documents
 Faculty Vitae
 Portfolios

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

	Team Leader	Common Stand. Cluster	Basic Credential Cluster	Services Credential Cluster	TOTAL
Program Faculty	37	62	44	22	165
Institutional Administration	10	35	9		54
Candidates	2	265	212	149	628
Graduates	2	95	70	75	242
Employers of Graduates	2	24	20	37	83
Supervising Practitioners	3	14	32	24	73
Advisors			15	8	23
School Administrators	2	29	14	40	85
Credential Analyst	1		3	1	5
Advisory Committee	13	12	18	18	61

TOTAL

1419

Note: Some of the interviews were conducted in a whole class setting, in which case the number of students in the class was listed. In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster or more than one time (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

NCATE STANDARDS/CCTC COMMON STANDARDS

STANDARD 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other professional school personnel know and demonstrate the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

A. Level: (initial and advanced)

B. Findings:

Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

The unit has state approved programs that are cross referenced to appropriate state and national standards through matrices for all initial and advanced programs.

“Students in all programs must earn a 2.8 GPA or a 2.85 GPA in the last 60 units in undergraduate work before acceptance into the Teacher Education Preparation Program. Data from the Fall 2002 admissions are:”

**Table 1-2: Teacher Education Programs, Average GPA and Number of Admitted Students, Fall 2002
(MA and credential program)**

Teacher Education Program	Average GPA at Admission	Number Admitted
Multiple Subject Education	3.30	111
Single Subject Education	3.39	53
Special Education	3.29	25*
TESL/Multicultural Education	3.24	5
Master of Arts in Teaching	3.32	3
Child and Adolescent Literacy	3.10	8
General Education	3.44	5

“Candidates, once accepted, must maintain a “B” or 3.0 GPA in all credential coursework. a “D” is unacceptable in any of the course work in the sequence.

The Graduate Record Exam is also required in each M.A. Program. The average GRE score by program for Fall, 2002 is:”

**Table 1-3: Average GRE Score by Teacher Education Program, Fall 2002 (N=135)
(Includes Master’s and credential candidates)**

Program	Analytical	Quantitative	Verbal
(Multiple) Elementary Education	559	540	502
(Single) Secondary Education	514	501	473
Special Education	470	426	420
TESL/Multicultural Education	554	528	448
Master of Arts in Teaching	553	508	506
Child and Adolescent Literacy	530	456	472
General Education	566	518	433

(Maximum score of 800 in each category)

“Students who do not meet the GPA admissions may be referred to the School of Education Exceptions Committee.” Interviews with the Exception Committee members verified this process. The following table indicates the numbers of students who applied and were not accepted

Table 1-4: Teacher Education Admissions Data

Semester	Number Applied	Number Rejected
Fall 2002	304	11
Spring 2002	43	3

Portfolios are an Exit Requirement in all programs. Scoring rubrics are used which are referenced to appropriate state and national standards.

Table 1-8: Teacher Education Portfolio Passing Rates

Program	Semester	Number of Candidates	Number Passing	Number Not Passing	In progress
Elementary	Fall 2001	16	16	0	0
	Spring 2002	49	46	0	3
Secondary	Fall 2001	0	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Spring 2002	39	27	0	12
Ed Specialist Level II*	Fall 2001	0	0	0	0
	Spring 2002	0	0	0	1

*Program added in 2000; can take 5 years to complete program.

The two teacher preparation tests mandated by the State of California are: the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) and the Reading Instruction Competency Assessment (RICA).

Table 1-7: Title II Data for Teacher Education

Year	Total Number of Program Completers	CBEST			RICA			Subject Matter (Secondary)			Subject Matter (Multiple Subjects)		
		T	P	%	T	P	%	T	P	%	T	P	%
1999-2000	89	*	*	*	87	86	99	*	*	*	*	*	*
2000-2001	92	92	92	100	77	77	100	5	**	**	22	22	100

Legend: N=Total Number of Program Completers; T=Program Completers who took any required exam; P=Program Completers who took and passed all the required exams; %=Percent passed; *=Data not required for Title II 1999-2000; **=Title II percentages not computed for less than 10 completers

“California is a state that has had its state program standards approved by NCATE’s Specialty Area Studies Board for alignment with SPA standards. The following table indicates the status of Subject Matter preparation and the aligned SPA (if appropriate):”

Table 1-5: Status of Subject Matter Preparation Programs at LMU

Program Area	Current Status	Aligned with SPA
Liberal Studies (Elementary Education)	Approved, New Program in State review process	n/a
English	Approved	National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE)
Mathematics	Approved	National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM)
Social Science	Previously Approved, undergoing revisions	National Council of Teachers of Social Studies (NCSS)
Science	Previously Approved, undergoing revisions	National Science Teachers Association (NSTA)
Spanish	Approved	American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL)
French	Previously Approved, undergoing revisions	American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL)
Art	Approved	National Association of Schools of Art and Design
Dance (Physical Education)	Approved as a partner to Cal State University Dominguez Hills	American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance (AAHPERD)

The BOE team confirmed these findings.

Interviews of cooperating teachers and administrators indicate a high degree of confidence regarding candidate content knowledge. Candidate surveys indicate a high degree of confidence concerning their respective preparation programs. In response to a questions regarding the level of prepared to work with the surrounding education communities, the following response were received from students (n=211, 2002)

Strongly agree-41%; Agree-44%; Neutral 13%, and Disagree-2%.

In response to the same questions, the Alumni response (n=160, 2002) was:

Strongly Agree-33%; Agree-45%; Neutral-19%; and Disagree 03%.

Employer survey results (n=86; 2002) regarding “content knowledge of subject matter” indicate:

Very high-38.375; High-55.81 %; Neutral-5.82%; Low-0.00%; and Very Low-0.00%.

Content Knowledge for Other Professional School Personnel

For entrance into all graduate programs, candidates must have an undergraduate 2.8 GPA, a graduate 3.0 GPA or be approved by the Exceptions Committee. In the Fall of 2002, the mean GPA of the admitted class was:

Table 1-10: Professional Services Programs, Average GPA and Number of Admitted Students, Fall 2002

Professional Services Program	Average GPA at Admission	Number Admitted
Administration	3.28	27*
School Counseling	3.19	54
School Psychology	3.46	13

*Includes 15 Catholic School Administration program candidates

All candidates pursuing a credential must pass the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST). Passage rate is 100% by definition for program admittance.

The GRE is required for admittance in each M.A. program.

Table 1-11: Average GRE Score by Program, Professional Services Division, Fall 2002 (N=114)

Program	Analytical	Quantitative	Verbal
Administration	483	491	429
School Counseling	467	447	413
School Psychology	521	499	456

(maximum score of 800 for each category)

Once in the program, each candidate must maintain a 3.0 GPA. The following table indicates the number of students who applied and the number of students not accepted in the Professional Services Division:

Table 1-12: Professional Services Division Admission Data

Semester	Number Applied	Number Rejected
Fall 2002	156	29
Spring 2002	32	1

All programs are approved and aligned with state standards. Follow up by the BOE team confirmed these findings.

Content knowledge evaluations by University Supervisors are:

Table 1-13: 1998-2002 Administration Fieldwork Evaluations, Content Knowledge

Content Knowledge Area:	Out- Standing	Strong	Average	Needs To Improve	Not Observed
<u>Educational Leadership</u>	24	8	0	0	1
Management of Schools	21	11	1	0	2
Instructional Program	22	8	0	0	3
Legal and Financial Aspects	17	12	0	0	5
Educational Governance and Politics	23	9	0	0	2
School-Community Collaborations	27	7	0	0	0

Table 1-14: 1998-2002 Counseling Fieldwork Evaluations, Knowledge of Individual and/or Group Counseling Techniques

Rubric Rating	Number of Students Receiving Rating	Percentage of Students Receiving Rating
Very Good	290	90%
Adequate	25	8%
Weak	0	0%
No Knowledge	7	2%

Table 1-15: 1998-2002 School Psychology Fieldwork Evaluations, Knowledge of Basic Research Methods Pertaining to Program Evaluation

Rubric Rating	Number of Students Receiving Rating	Percentage of Students Receiving Rating
Very High	38	53%
High	23	32%
Neutral	11	15%
Low	0	0%
Very Low	0	0%

In response to the question regarding program preparation and the ability to work with the surrounding educational communities, students replied (n=86, 2002);

Strongly agree-34%; Agree-46%; Neutral-14%, and Disagree-6%.

In response to the same questions, Alumni replied (n=73, 2002);

Strongly Agree =58%; Agree-37%; Neutral-5%. Although Disagree was not included in the results, this fact does not appear to affect the validity of the survey.

State tests are not required to demonstrate content knowledge. Completion of the approved program indicates appropriate content knowledge.

Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates

Pedagogical content knowledge is assessed through course work within the respective programs. Course work is grouped around the following themes: diversity issues; children and adolescent growth and development (learning and develop); and teaching methodology. Courses are aligned to appropriate standards and reflection is a major component of the curriculum. Assessments include: performance assessments, research projects, and case studies. Exit (culminating) Portfolios are required of all programs

Table 1-17: Multiple and Single Subject Education Portfolio Rubric

Standard	Fall 2001			Spring 2002		
	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
1. Engage and Support All Students in Learning	0	16	0	0	83	2
4. Plan Instruction And Design Learning	0	16	0	0	68	11

Technology requirements are infused throughout the curriculum. Through school visits and candidate interviews, the use of PowerPoint and the Internet was verified. Blackboard is used by many instructors as part of the instructional process. All faculty have a Web Page with appropriate information for candidates.

Interviews with cooperating teachers indicate a high degree of satisfaction with the pedagogical content knowledge of candidates. Results of the employer survey (n=86, 2002) regarding the ability of candidates to integrate theory into practice are:

Strongly agree (that candidates can integrate theory and practice)-50.00; Agree-35%; Neutral-6.98; Disagree-0.00; and Strongly Disagree-0.00.

Interviews with graduates indicate a high degree of confidence in the ability to integrate theory into practice (pedagogical content knowledge) and attribute this confidence to the programs offered by the school of education.

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates

All programs have been aligned with the standards of the California Commission for Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) Additionally, as required by SB 2042 all Multisubject and Single Subject Credential Programs have been aligned to INTASC Principles. Attainment of these standards are reflected in the Exit (culminating) Portfolio for Multisubject and Single Subject candidates and in final evaluations for special education candidates and are demonstrated in the student teaching/internship semester. In the absence of a licensure examination, the results of surveys from the appropriate supervisors are significant data.

Table 1-19: Multiple and Single Subject Fieldwork Evaluations Completed by Mentor Teachers, 1998-2002

	Markedly Above Average	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Unsatisfac tory
<u>Plans and organizes lessons in terms of pupils' growth in knowledge, as well as in attitudes, understandings and appreciations.</u>	310	241	57	1	0
Executes plans successfully, making appropriate adjustments to meet the emerging needs of all students including Limited English Proficient students.	329	276	60	2	0
Effectively mediates the English language development of second language learners, including support for the primary language when possible, for non-English speakers.	269	241	72	1	0

“Table 20 indicates the completion rate for all candidates in all programs in the culminating course for each program. Since some students need extra time to finish their portfolio or other requirements, it is possible for students to receive an Incomplete in the course and finish the requirements with a two year period.”

Table 1-20: Completion of Final Course In Teacher Education Programs

	2000-2001			2001-2002		
	Course Completed for Credit	“T” Completed for Credit	“T” Remains	Course Completed for Credit	“T” Completed for Credit	“T” Remains
Elementary Education	10	11	5	38	5	3
Secondary Education	13	11	2	16	5	6
Special Education	2	1	3	4	2	4
Master of Arts in Teaching	1	1	0	1	0	0
General Education	4	1	0	1	4	1
Child and Adolescent Literacy/Literacy & Lang.	16	3	0	8	1	5
TESL/Bilingual Bicultural	4	1	0	0	3	0

Interviews with cooperating teachers and administrators indicate a high degree of satisfaction with the professional and pedagogical content knowledge of candidates. Results of employer surveys (n=86, 2002) results for the “overall” topic of professional preparation are:

Very High-60.47; High-29.07; Neutral-6.98; Low-3.49; and, Very low-0.

Interviews with candidates and graduates indicate a high degree of confidence in their professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. Surveys of Alumni and candidates (2002) indicate overwhelming agreement that their program has prepared them with the appropriate knowledge and skills.

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Other School Personnel

Appropriate program standards are referenced to courses within the program. Assessments are required for each course related to the course objectives. Key core courses emphasize content knowledge in curriculum; cultural diversity; assessment and research methods; human development; and special education. Examples of assessments requirements are: case studies, field experiences, supervised field work, and the Exit (culminating) Portfolio.

In the absence of a California exit examination requirement, evaluative data from the University Supervisor regarding the candidate’s professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills are significant. Results are:

Table 1-21: 1998-2002 Administration Fieldwork Evaluations, Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills

Content Knowledge Area:	Out- Standing	Strong	Average	Needs To Improve	Not Observed
<u>Educational Leadership</u>	24	9	0	0	1
Management of Schools	23	8	0	0	3
Instructional Program	20	9	0	0	5
Legal and Financial Aspects	16	12	0	0	5
Educational Governance and Politics	23	10	0	0	1
School-Community Collaborations	16	6	0	0	0

Table 1-22: 1998-2002 Counseling Fieldwork Evaluations, Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills, Knowledge of Individual and/or Group Counseling Techniques

Rubric Rating	Number of Students Receiving Rating	Percentage of Students Receiving Rating
Very Good	290	90%
Adequate	25	8%
Weak	0	0%
No Knowledge	7	2%

Table 1-23: 1998-2002 School Psychology Fieldwork Evaluations, Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills, Prediction of Success as a School Psychologist

Rubric Rating	Number of Students Receiving Rating	Percentage of Students Receiving Rating
Very High	83	85%
High	14	14%
Neutral	1	1%
Low	0	0%
Very Low	0	0%

Interviews and follow up surveys indicate a high degree of confidence in the preparation received in the respective programs.

In response to the questions regarding the integration of theory into practice in the Student Survey (n=43, Administrative Services, 1998-2002), the results were:

Excellent-62.8%; Gppd-34.9%; Satisfactory-3.3%; Needs improvement-0.00%; and Unsatisfactory-0.00%

In response to the question regarding the integration of theory into practice in the Student Survey (n=67; School Counseling, 1998-2002), the results are:

Excellent-65.7%; Good-31.3%; Satisfactory-3%; Needs Improvement-0.00%; and Unsatisfactory 0.00

Dispositions for All Candidates

The School of Education is in the process of consolidating the SOE Dispositions. The twenty-one (21) proficiencies developed from the seven tenets of the Conceptual Framework have been consolidated into four Outcomes: They are:

- Respect and value all individuals and communities**
- Educate by integrating theory into practice**
- Advocate for access to a socially just education**
- Lead in order to facilitate transformation**

Thus the dispositions are REAL. These dispositions which are derived from the Conceptual Framework do not differ across programs.

Candidates are informed of the dispositions through various courses within the program and through the interview process in the program benchmarks.

Dispositions are assessed through the above mentioned interview process and through the process of a Concerns Form. A process exists for the course instructor to initiate a “red flag” or a concern (Concerns Form) about a student. Originally, this form was used for both academic and disposition issues but in recent years, it has become a disposition form only. The procedure involves the Program Coordinator, an appeals process for the student, and an appropriate remediation and exiting from the program.

Through candidate and alumni interviews and through survey results it is apparent that the dispositions in some format (due to the consolidation of the dispositions) are known. The results

of both student and alumni surveys (2002) indicate overall agreement and understanding of the SOE Dispositions.

Interviews of cooperating teachers and administrators indicate that the candidates both know and display the appropriate dispositions.

Student Learning for Teacher Candidates

Included within the twenty-one (21) SOE proficiencies are the following standards for student learning

- I “Integrate theory and practice, course by course, and especially in fieldwork assignments;
- Model sociocultural/constructivist perspectives by engaging in learning, which requires active participation and engagement, in which students construct knowledge;
 - Accept the need to create a culturally responsive pedagogy that promotes equitable learning for all students and closes the differential achievement gap;
 - Use technology as a tool that allows all educators to do their jobs effectively but also as a tool to offer opportunities for empowerment to individuals and communities.”

These standards are imbedded within the coursework of the respective programs.

The Exit (culminating) Portfolio is another and perhaps the most significant method of assessing candidate’s ability to impact student learning.

Table 1-25: Multiple and Single Subject Education Portfolio Rubric

Standard	Fall 2001			Spring 2002		
	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
5. Assessing Student Learning	0	12	0	0	69	12

In response to the questions “How well are candidates prepared to teach/help students learn?” (n=26, Employer Survey, 2002) the responses were:

Very High-58%; High-34%; Neutral 4%; and, Low-4%.

Student Learning for Other School Personnel

Candidates in the Professional Services Division are expected to demonstrate competencies in the same four areas the Teacher Education Program. They are:

- “Integrate theory and practice, course by course, and especially in fieldwork assignments;
- Model sociocultural/constructivist perspectives by engaging in learning, which requires active participation and engagement, in which students construct knowledge;
- Accept the need to create a culturally responsive pedagogy that promotes equitable learning for all students and closes the differential achievement gap;

- Use technology as a tool that allows all educators to do their jobs effectively but also as a tool to offer opportunities for empowerment to individuals and communities.

These standards are imbedded within the course work, field experiences and assessments.”

The culminating field experiences are a semester experience spent in the school under the guidance of University Supervisors. Evaluations by the University Supervisors indicate:

1-26

Table 1-26: Administration Fieldwork Evaluation, Student Learning (1998-2002)

	Out- Standing	Strong	Average	Needs To Improve	Not Observed
<u>Instructional Program</u>	23	7	1	0	3

Table 1-27: 1998-2002 Counseling Fieldwork Evaluation, Student Learning, Competencies for Providing Services Based on Professional Ethics, Confidentiality, Individual Rights, Legal Aspects and Constraints

Rubric Rating	Number of Students Receiving Rating	Percentage of Students Receiving Rating
Very Good	296	90%
Adequate	21	6%
Weak	0	0%
No Knowledge	11	3%

Table 1-28: 1998-2002 School Psychology Fieldwork Evaluation, Student Learning, Knowledge of the Provisions of the Education Code Pertaining to Assessment, Eligibility and the I.E.P. Process

Rubric Rating	Number of Students Receiving Rating	Percentage of Students Receiving Rating
Very High	41	43%
High	38	39%
Neutral	17	18%
Low	0	0%
Very Low	0	0%

Overall Assessment of Standard

Candidates in the initial and advanced programs possess the knowledge and skills required by state and national standards. Candidates in the initial and advanced programs display the appropriate dispositions as required by the institution in the Conceptual Framework. Assessment instruments are used and data are analyzed.

C. NCATE Team Recommendation: Met at the initial level; Met at the advanced level

D. Areas for Improvement

Previous Weakness Removed:

Category 1 Standard 1.B The unit does not ensure that post-baccalaureate in the Single Subject Credential program complete sufficient general studies courses or experiences in the liberal arts and sciences

Rationale: All candidates must complete a liberal arts core curriculum of a minimum of 48 semester hours divided among the following: American Cultures, College Writing, Communication, critical and Creative Arts, History, Literature, Mathematics, Science and Technology, Philosophy, Social Sciences and Theology. Graduates of other institutions enrolled in the post-Baccalaureate programs complete their studies in an accredited university.

New Areas for Improvement: None

E. State Team Decision: Standard Met

STANDARD 2. Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on the applicant qualifications, the candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs.

A. LEVEL: Initial and Advanced

B. FINDINGS

Assessment System

The School of Education (SOE), led by the Assessment Committee (formed in 2000-2001) and presently chaired by the Associate Dean (as of June 2002), has developed an Assessment System and implementation timeline with input from a variety of stakeholders, both in and out of the University including the SOE Advisory Board, the university-wide Teacher Education Committee, full and part-time faculty, candidates, alumni, and employers. Before this, each Program Coordinator was fairly independent in designing program policies, procedures and assessments. In order to further develop and implement the Assessment System and coordinate it throughout program areas, an additional position, Assessment Coordinator, has been requested for the 2003-2004 academic year. This position will manage data on an on-going basis, working with the Associate Dean and Program Coordinators to ensure aligned collection and analysis of assessment data. Additionally, the SOE is collaborating with a university assessment specialist to refine, coordinate, and upgrade the use of technology in this process by adapting and creating responsive software design and interfaces.

The Assessment System is based on operational definitions of the Conceptual Framework. Twenty-one unit outcomes were identified under 4 dispositions: **Respect** and **Value** all individuals and communities, **Educate** by integrating theory into practice, **Advocate** for access to a socially just education, and **Lead** in order to facilitate transformation. They also reflect the overall mission and goals of the SOE. The Assessment System is designed to align with

professional standards (e.g. APA, NCTE), as well as California standards. Unit outcomes are translated into 21 candidate proficiencies relevant for each of the two divisions: Teacher Education and Professional Services. This process is being overseen by Program Coordinators aided by program faculty who created alignment matrices that connect the proficiencies, state standards, and professional organization standards. The timeline for full implementation of this system is designed to accommodate consensus-building and collaboration among stakeholders as well as the requirements of the NCATE Transition Plan.

The Assessment System is designed to monitor candidate performance through a comprehensive and integrated set of multiple evaluation measures at 5 key benchmarks: admission, progressing to fieldwork, culminating fieldwork, exiting program, beyond program. Assessments at these transition points are designed to ensure that candidates have the appropriate knowledge, skills and dispositions to progress through the program.

Initial and Advanced admissions criteria include GPA and/or Baccalaureate degree, a B average in prerequisite courses, test scores (CBEST, GRE), recommendations, US Constitution requirement (CA), interview, and division review as appropriate. Candidates in the TFA and PLACE programs have separate paths for admission that merge with the SOE procedures; but candidates must meet the same requirements. Candidates in some programs must also have completed volunteer experiences with children/youth. In order to ensure fairness and expand opportunities, students may request a GPA Exception. This application is reviewed by the Exceptions Committee. Once students admitted under this process have passed additional coursework with a B average or better, they become part of the general student population. Additionally, some programs have technology requirements. Admissions criteria are monitored by the Admissions Coordinator, Credential Analyst, Associate Dean, Program Coordinators, and when necessary in individual cases, the Dean.

In order to progress to fieldwork or clinical practice, students in Initial and Advanced programs must have demonstrated content and pedagogical knowledge as indicated by course grades and program-specific pre-field assessments (e.g. RICA for elementary candidates), have the recommendation of the Program Coordinator, and pass division review.

In order to participate in the culminating fieldwork (internship or student teaching), candidates' course grades, formative field assessments (self assessments, site supervisor assessments, and university supervisor assessment, TPA's) are evaluated. Candidates must also pass a division review and receive the recommendation of the Program Coordinator.

In order to exit the program, Initial and Advanced candidates must have successfully completed course requirements, successfully completed field work/clinical practice internships, demonstrated competencies through their culminating experiences as appropriate to individual programs and levels (comprehensive exam or thesis, portfolios,) as well as receive the coordinator recommendation. Culminating portfolios are assessed by a review committee using evaluation rubrics for inter-rater reliability.

Monitoring of graduates takes place through regular surveys of alumni and employers as well as alumni focus groups. These surveys include items related to effectiveness of advising, and governance of the unit, etc. as well as program impact and satisfaction. According to these surveys, SOE activities and assessments contribute to candidate success and candidates report

they were well-prepared. Additionally, 100% of candidates pass state exams (RICA, CBEST, and other professional credentialing assessments).

A Concerns Form (recently revised as a Dispositions Form) is used by faculty to bring candidates to the attention of Program Coordinators when there are issues surrounding a candidate's potential for success in meeting the SOE expectations in behavior, attitudes, and dispositions. Conferences, advising, and coaching then occur to help the candidate address these issues. Records of this process including its resolution are maintained by Program Coordinators in individual candidate's files. To help ensure fairness in this component of the Assessment System, a lawyer addressed faculty concerns about the potential for assessor bias in assessing the more subjective aspects of attitudes and dispositions.

The SOE is continuing to refine these processes through the use of additional technology, but more significantly, through the next steps of aligning the admission recommendation form, project and portfolio rubrics, observation guidelines, syllabi, etc. with the standards, outcomes, and dispositions to ensure that these are consistent within and across all courses, levels, and program areas. This is being addressed at program level meetings, SOE committees as well as by the faculty (FT and PT) as a whole at their two annual meetings. Revised student and faculty handbooks, some aligned syllabi, a pilot observation form, and portfolio rubrics are already in evidence.

Data Collection, Analysis, Evaluation

Evaluation measures assess candidate performance and unit operations data is used to improve the overall functioning of the unit. The Assessment System is maintained and monitored by the Assessment Committee, Associate Dean, Program Coordinators, Admissions and Credentialing staff, as well as through technology support and provides information to stakeholders in the SOE. The unit regularly and systematically collects admissions data; surveys of candidates, alumni, and employers; program and course syllabi; course and faculty evaluations; and candidate work samples. Records of formal complaints are maintained and resolutions are documented in individual Program Coordinators' files. A system does not yet exist to compile, summarize and/or analyze data regularly across the SOE programs.

Records of clinical and field placements (including site demographics) for Initial and Advanced Candidates are collected and mentors/supervisors are individually assessed. Presently, no coordinated system exists to track or manage these candidate experiences.

Candidate exit portfolios are assessed by committees using rubrics to ensure that they include P-12 student impact and candidate reflections consistent with the Conceptual Framework and specific Program outcomes and standards. Minutes of the Teacher Education Committee and Council of Coordinators support these efforts to learn from candidate work and use it to assess how the SOE's Conceptual Framework and Outcomes benefit P-12 students.

Currently, data is collected on Excel spreadsheets and interface with the Banner system is inconsistent. SOE Assessment Committee personnel are collaborating with university personnel and SOE faculty/staff to create an electronic database that will interface with the Banner system currently in use. In addition, they are reviewing software that will assist with improved thorough collection and analysis of qualitative data including uploading portfolios for more effective monitoring according to standards. The "Remark" software program, which allows inputting of word data online and through OCR of paper responses is being explored.

Use of Data for Program Improvement

The SOE regularly and systematically uses data to evaluate courses, programs, & faculty. Exit interviews are conducted with all students to determine the strengths/weaknesses of their programs and are used to focus improvement efforts. Course evaluations are conducted at the end of each semester and include feedback on the course and the instructor. The Dean shares the results of these with Program Coordinators who share them with program faculty. Evaluations of new part-time faculty are also conducted at mid-semester and include both student input and faculty mentor observations with follow-up conferences. Additionally, annual surveys are conducted of students, alumni, and employers. The SOE has used this data in revisions of course content to eliminate redundancy and to make hiring and rehiring decisions for faculty.

Overall Assessment of Standard

The LMU School of Education has an assessment plan and system at the Initial and Advanced levels that collect and analyze data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance and unit operation to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs. Additionally, the SOE is in the process of responding to a variety of changes in state standards and requirements (new tests, 2042) and in the university as a whole (new facilities, new administrative structure –dean & associate dean). The SOE itself is in transition from structures and policies that supported significant program autonomy to those that ensure consistency and collaboration within the unit as a whole. Rapid growth in enrollment and program offerings (PLACE, Intern, TFA) has also impacted the implementation of the Assessment System and processes for formalizing, systematizing, and making explicit previously more implicit, personal, and informal data collection, analysis, and responses.

C. NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard Met

D. Areas for Improvement: None

E. State Team Decision: Standard Met

STANDARD 3. Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school personnel develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

A. Level: (initial and/or advanced)

B. Findings:

Students in the initial and advanced programs in the School of Education participate in field experiences, which are part of all credential and professional preparation programs. These field experiences and clinical practices are embedded within the professional preparation programs

offered at the School of Education. Field experiences are integrated throughout all credential programs, gradually increasing the candidates' exposure within the schools. Elementary candidates participate in two, eight-week Student Teaching assignments, secondary candidates in one eighteen-week Student Teaching assignment, and special education candidates in one fifteen-week Student Teaching assignment, at least one of which is in a culturally and/or linguistically diverse setting. At the advanced level field experiences involve completion of hours required by the program and activity-based requirements for the program. Each program follows the guidelines set forth by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing in the area of selection of school sites and supervisory personnel. Each field experience sequence involves developing a definition and criteria for placement, supervision, duration, and evaluation.

Collaboration between Unit and School Partners

The School of Education has established a relationship with local school districts, schools, administrators, and supervisors. Many of the school personnel are members of the Internship Advisory Board and have been involved in recommendations for possible field experiences and clinical practices. The unit works with school districts in the area surrounding the University that meet the diverse needs of the programs. Additional partnership programs include Teach for America and Ánimo Charter High School. The unit also works closely with the Los Angeles Archdiocese in placing students for the PLACE Corps and supervising those who are teaching in Catholic schools. Program Coordinators have the responsibility of selecting the sites used for field experiences and clinical practice. At the initial level, Coordinators meet with Principals or designees from the school sites and jointly determine the Master Teachers for each assignment. Questionnaires are given to each Master Teacher to verify their training and levels of expertise. Additionally, Coordinators or Assistant Coordinators subsequently observe potential Master Teachers in their classroom and meet with them to review the expectations of the experience and to ensure that they possess the prerequisite knowledge necessary for a successful mentorship. Interns that are completing certification requirements and are already on the job are required to self-select a mentor on-site that is available to assist them and function as a model for the duration of their field experience. During interviews conducted it was expressed that University Supervisors provide assistance to candidates in finding a mentor however some candidates did not have mentors. At the advanced level, site-level clinical personnel are generally self-selected at the candidate's workplace. In cases where a candidate is already employed, University Supervisors and site-level personnel work together to provide experiences that meet all field requirements for their particular program. The unit considers appropriate field experience and clinical practice sites to be those that are fully accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), State or appropriate accrediting agencies, have site leadership which supports the School of Education's goals and is willing to enter into a collaborative dialogue with the School and have a P-12 student population that can provide diversity and a full range of experiences for the candidates. The unit offers opportunities for diverse settings in the field experience however there is no system in place that tracks whether the field placements at the initial and advanced levels are diverse for all candidates and that also ensures that all requirements have been met. During interviews it was expressed by field placement coordinators a need of having a better tracking system for field experiences for all students in light of some of the new state requirements. It was expressed that the unit is considering hiring an Internship Coordinator/Clinical in the Fall semester 2003 to assist with the tracking process and to serve as a liaison with school districts for field placements.

Design, Implementation and Evaluation of Field Experiences and Clinical Practices

Field experiences or clinical practices are required at the initial and advanced level and follow a clearly defined sequence of experiences tied to the Conceptual Framework. The sequence of the programs ensures that candidates have opportunities to demonstrate subject-matter competencies, skills, and dispositions before being allowed to continue in their field of study and participate in a field or clinical experience. Candidates may participate in methodology classes, professional coursework, or clinical practice once they have met all of the prerequisite requirements. These requirements include qualifying Education coursework, technology proficiency, verification of experience working with children, a minimum 2.8 G.P.A., and passage of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST). In initial teacher preparation programs students are required to perform a series of classroom observations over several courses eventually culminating in practice lessons, and finally in the Student Teaching clinical practice. All Teacher Education Student Teachers are required to participate in the culture of their schools and become part of the instructional team by attending faculty meetings, department and grade-level meetings, Parent Conferences, staff development in-services, technology workshops, Open Houses, and other school-sponsored activities. Field experiences for students in the Teacher Education program who are already teaching take place in their own classroom settings. The Teacher Practitioner programs require candidates to identify an on-site mentor at their school and to teach a variety of lessons that demonstrate the theoretical constructs of specific courses before initial assessment and final clinical practice can be completed. During the semester in which elementary and secondary education candidates are participating in their Field Experience they attend a weekly seminar at the University. The seminar provides additional support and learning in areas such as classroom management, art production, specific technological applications, resumes/interviewing techniques, and professional career development are covered along with the tenets of the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession*. These standards comprehensively address the areas of engaging and supporting all learners, creating effective environments for learning, organizing subject matter, planning instruction, assessing learning, and professional development for educators. At the advanced level, candidates complete required components of their program which include a variety of projects, record of hours spent in the field, and samples of student work. Technology knowledge and skills are embedded throughout all programs and candidates have opportunities to apply their technology skills within their field experiences. All candidates at both levels are given an Intern Handbook that provides details about competencies, procedures for evaluation along with all of the forms that are to be submitted to the unit upon completion of the field experience. All site-level clinical personnel have appropriate certification, academic preparation and successful experience in the appropriate credential and/or content area. Site-level clinical personnel in all programs are provided with an orientation that covers the Mission and Goals, the Conceptual Framework, course design, and expectations. Emphasis is given to the tenets of integration of theory into practice, leadership and social justice in diverse schools. They are also provided with handbooks that delineate responsibilities and supply examples of forms used as well as practical suggestions for successful supervision. Support is provided for them by full-time faculty through regular meetings and both telephone and email contact.

Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions to Help all Students Learn

Throughout their field experiences, candidates are guided in creating written reflections and to reflect with other candidates on their practices and their effects on student learning. Questions are posed to candidates for their reflections on topics such as classroom management, instructional strategies, diversity and discipline. Candidates are also required to demonstrate

mastery of content area and pedagogical and professional knowledge. Multiple assessments are used to determine competency of candidates participating in field experiences and clinical practice. Master Teacher and/or Mentor, University Supervisors provide formative and summative evaluations of the candidate's performance. These include on-going observations, evaluation of lesson plans and instructional units prepared by the candidate. Master Teachers complete both mid-term and end of term evaluations. Midterm evaluations provide the candidates with constructive comments regarding areas that need improvement as well as areas of strength. The midterm evaluations center around the areas of classroom instruction, social curriculum and professional development and are tied directly to elements of the Conceptual Framework. The end-of-term evaluations appraise the candidate's proficiency in teaching specifically in the area of knowledge of subject matter, student assessment, student engagement, planning and designing instruction, classroom management, and professional development. At the conclusion of the elementary and secondary programs, exit interviews are conducted along with completion of a final candidate evaluation form or Professional Portfolio that documents the application of the content, pedagogical, and professional knowledge acquired by the candidate. The portfolios contain examples of student work and reflections on the candidate's capability to plan and design learning experiences for all students. Additionally, candidates develop a personal Philosophy of Education and a professional resume. Beginning Spring 2003, all students will be expected to make an oral presentation of their Culminating Portfolio to supervisors and other candidates at the completion of their clinical practice. Throughout the advanced level programs, the development of sound pedagogical applications is fostered by the integration of knowledge bases and clinical and field-based experiences. These experiences are sequenced to parallel the candidate's development of the knowledge bases in the field as well as practical professional skills, and dispositions. Each advanced level program develops a culminating portfolio that demonstrates the candidate's knowledge, skills and disposition required for their area of concentration. In addition candidates participate in an exit interview and complete a comprehensive exam.

Overall Assessment of Standard

At the initial and advanced level the unit offers programs that are based on research, guidelines provided by the state of California, and recommendations from program advisory committees. The unit offers both credential and master's degree programs that meet the guidelines specified. Field experiences provide opportunities for candidates to demonstrate their knowledge, skills and dispositions in a multicultural setting. The field experiences requirements reflect the principles outlined in the conceptual framework.

A. NCATE Team Recommendation: Met

B. Areas for Improvement:

1. The unit offers opportunities for diverse settings in the field experience however there is no system in place that tracks whether the field placements at the initial and advanced levels are diverse for all candidates.

Rationale: During interviews it was expressed by field placement coordinators a need of having a better tracking system for field experiences for all students. There is no system in place that ensures that all students are placed in diverse settings.

2. Some interns completing their final internship did not have mentors assigned.

Rationale: During interviews conducted it was expressed that University Supervisors provide assistance to candidates in finding a mentor however some candidates did not have mentors.

E. State Team Decision: Standard Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns

STANDARD 4. Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and experiences for candidates to acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. These experiences include working with diverse higher education and school faculty, diverse candidates, and diverse students in P-12 schools.

A. Level: Initial and Advanced

B. Findings

The faculty, staff and students of the School of Education understand and declare their purpose to be the encouragement of life-long learning and academic excellence, the education of the whole person, and the promotion of service and justice for all. With this purpose in mind, the faculty, staff, and students strive to work collaboratively in a student-centered environment to be professionals who act to, among other things, value and respect all individuals, promote social justice, promote cultural responsiveness, and develop moral, intellectual, responsible, and caring leaders.

Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Curriculum and Experiences

Loyola Marymount University has instituted a relatively new position of Assistant to the President for Intercultural Affairs. The assistant provides campus wide leadership, direction, and coordination in the areas of diversity, interculturalism, and equity. The College of Education students, faculty, administration, and staff are committed to promoting practices that promote social justice and equity in educational institutions. Candidates in all programs within the College are required to take core courses with strong emphasis on issues of diversity both for the candidate personally and for their professional preparation. Candidates for Multiple Subject, Single Subject and the Education Specialist Credentials are required to take Cultural Paradigms of Education, which focuses on culture, ethnicity, race, and class as well as issues of gender and sexual orientation, relationships of language and culture, and culturally sensitive pedagogy. Multiple Subject and Educational Specialist candidates follow this course with Applied Educational Psychology for Elementary Years while Single Subject candidates are required to take Applied Educational Psychology for Adolescent Years. Among other topics, these courses include students with exceptional needs, physical development, peer relationships, and theories of child/adolescent development. Additional required courses for Multiple and Single subject candidates include topics such as first and second language acquisition, diversity and learning, second language acquisition methods, educational diversity and equality, and ethnic minorities.

Candidates engage in a variety of in-class activities that promote specific instructional techniques that will impact student achievement for students of diverse backgrounds. Candidates may also enroll in programs with a bilingual emphasis in Spanish. All methods courses include a focus on pedagogical practices that is culturally sensitive, curriculum that is culturally responsive, procedures for differentiating curriculum, instruction, and materials to meet the varying needs of each student served, and subject-specific materials and resources for successfully teaching all students. Candidates are also required to develop lesson plans in their methods classes that specify how the lessons will be adapted for all students. The evaluation of candidates' attainment of competencies related to diversity is embedded in each course and supervised during field experiences and clinical practices.

Advanced credential candidates are required to take courses embedded with strong emphasis on issues of diversity. Candidates must take Anthropological Analysis of Cultural Diversity in which they study issues of immigration, ethnic diversity, critical pedagogy, and research on culturally diverse groups and acquire the knowledge to be able to serve diverse populations. Furthermore, candidates learn about exceptionality in the Education of Culturally/Linguistically Diverse Students with Exceptional Needs. Candidates deepen their knowledge base on exceptionality and learn how legislation, policies and practices address the special education of exceptional students. The evaluation of candidates' attainment of competencies related to diversity is embedded in each course and supervised during field experiences and clinical practices.

Experiences Working with Diverse Faculty

Ethnic makeup of the tenure track faculty is 65% White; 17% Hispanic; and 17% Asian/Pacific Islander. Ethnic makeup of part time Faculty who teach classes is 67% White; 15% Hispanic; 13% African American; 2% American Indian; and 2% Asian/Pacific Islander. Ethnic makeup of part time Faculty who supervise fieldwork is 67% White; 14% Hispanic; 14% African American; and 5% Asian/Pacific Islander. The aggregate ethnic data for the faculty in the School of Education is 67% White; 16% Hispanic; 10% African American; 7% Asian/Pacific Islander; and 1% American Indian. Full time tenure track faculty are 48% female and 52% male; part time faculty who teach classes are 70% female and 30% male; part time faculty supervisors are 86% female and 14% male; and the total faculty for the School of Education are 68% female and 32% male.

The commitment of the School of Education community to promote acceptance of diversity starts with the recruitment of School of Education faculty members who come from diverse backgrounds and profess to value diversity. Recognizing that our candidates will be working with diverse students in P-12 schools, the School of Education has made an effort to recruit and retain faculty who are knowledgeable about and sensitive to preparing candidates to work with these diverse students, through their academic preparation, continued scholarly endeavors, teaching, and life experiences. The Assistant to the President for Intercultural Affairs provides development opportunities for faculty to help bring out dispositions of interviewees regarding cultural diversity issues in the interview process for hiring faculty. While Loyola Marymount University is a Catholic institution, they have been able to recruit faculty who are affiliated with various religious groups. School of Education faculty members have a wealth of experience working with P-12 students from diverse backgrounds prior to assuming full-time responsibilities at the University. Faculty in the School of Education are continually conducting research on issues surrounding diversity on topics such as: the intersection of religion and sexual

orientation, the effect of language policies on bilingual students, moral dilemmas in educational settings, inclusion and the mission of the university, and technology and diverse learners. Faculty members share their scholarship with candidates and other faculty members as a way to advance conversations on issues surrounding diversity. The School of Education has made a commitment to allow faculty to stay up-to-date on issues of diversity by participating in state, national, and international conferences both as presenters and learners.

Experiences Working with Diverse Candidates

Loyola Marymount University welcomes applications from students “without regard to race, color, gender, creed, national origin, disability, marital status, or religion.” The School of Education values the diversity of their students and has been fortunate to recruit students from a variety of diverse backgrounds. Among School of Education students, there are students from urban and rural areas, first generation immigrants, second language learners, second career students, students who are the first one in their families to attend college or graduate school.

The Conceptual Framework focuses on educational success for all learners through respect, education, advocacy, and leadership. Based on these dispositions, the School of Education is committed to having multiple opportunities for candidates to interact with and learn from diverse people, including fellow candidates. The School of Education has a partnership with Animo Charter High School that allows students from the Teacher Education program to tutor high school students. It is hoped that this partnership effort will result in students from Animo attending college, choosing education as a career, and choosing Loyola Marymount for their university work. Animo will have 12th grade students next year.

Based on fall 2002 data, the University graduate student ethnicity is 44% White, Non-Hispanic; 18% Declined to State; 15% Hispanic; 10% Asian/Pacific Islander; 7% Black, Non-Hispanic; and 5% Non-Resident Alien/International. These numbers represent a decrease in the non-resident Aliens/International, Asian/Pacific Islander, and White non-Hispanic and an increase in the other categories since 1999. Graduate students are 60% female, which is an increase from 56% in 1999. Student ethnic data from the fall 2000 for the College of Education is 41% White, Non-Hispanic; 17% Declined to State; 24% Hispanic; 8% Asian/Pacific Islander; 7% Black, Non-Hispanic; and 2% Non-Resident Alien/International. These numbers represent a decrease in the percentage of White and Hispanic students and an increase in Black and “Declined to State” students. Female students are 79% of the students in the College of Education, which is a slight increase from 78% in 2000.

The ethnicity of Liberal Studies students is 55% White, Non-Hispanic; 28% Hispanic; 8% Asian Pacific; 5% Decline to State; 3% African American; and 1% other. Female candidates represent 97% of the population in this program.

Experiences working with Diverse Students in P-12 Schools

The School of Education makes a concerted effort to ensure that candidates have experience working in diverse P-12 schools. Field experiences and clinical practice placements are selected to guarantee that candidates have experience with diverse student populations. All candidates have multiple opportunities to apply and refine their knowledge, skills, and dispositions learned during course work in diverse school settings. Each teacher candidate uses knowledge, skills, and dispositions gained in coursework to demonstrate their ability to plan and deliver instruction

and assess student learning in a culturally sensitive manner. Candidates develop expertise with diverse students under the supervision of both university and district field supervisors. Supervisors seek evidence of candidate performance in appropriate planning, implementation, and evaluation of learning activities for students from different ethnic backgrounds. During post-observation conferences, supervisors and candidates reflect on and critique the candidate's performance with diverse students.

Loyola Marymount University cooperates with a number of school districts and the Catholic Schools is the area surrounding the campus. A large portion field experiences and clinical practice (student teaching) occurs in the Los Angeles Unified School District whose ethnic population consists of 71% Hispanic; 12% African American; 10% White; 5% Asian/Pacific Islander; and less than 1% American Indian. The remaining school districts and private schools reflect a similar diversity.

Overall Assessment of Standard

All teacher education programs at the initial and advanced level have required courses that address the issue of diversity and provide opportunities for candidates to demonstrate knowledge, skills and dispositions related to diversity. Field experiences at the initial and advance levels are set in diverse settings and students are able to apply their skills and strategies with students from diverse backgrounds.

The University has a faculty position that reports directly to the President for campus wide leadership, direction, and coordination in the areas of diversity, interculturalism, and equity. The College of Education recruits candidates with diverse backgrounds into their teacher education programs. In addition plans are also in place to continue recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty. Candidates and faculty represent a diverse group that assists in the development of strategies for improving student learning both at the University and in the public P-12 school settings.

C. NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard Met

D. Areas for Improvement: None

E. State Team Decision: Standard Met

STANDARD 5: Faculty Performance and Development

Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

A. Level: Initial and Advanced

B. Findings:

Qualified Faculty

The unit's professional education faculty currently include six categories of faculty members:

- 14 regular, full-time tenured (10) or tenure-track (4) faculty members, all of whom have doctoral degrees in their teaching fields (or in closely related fields) and 10 of whom are credentialed and experienced in those fields in K-12 schools or school districts
- 6 full-time nontenure-track "visiting" faculty members, three of whom have doctoral degrees and three of whom have Master's degrees in their teaching fields (or in closely related fields) and three of whom are credentialed and experienced in those fields in K-12 schools or school districts
- 3 full-time nontenure-track "clinical" faculty members, all of whom have Master's degrees and are credentialed and experienced in the fields in which they supervise, advise, or teach, one of whom supervises in the unit's secondary education program and two of whom work with the two cohorts (60 students/cohort) in the two-year Teach for America program
- A group of as many as 35-40 part-time faculty who are employed full-time outside the University and typically teach one course each semester in either Initial teacher education programs or in Advanced Master's or credential programs in educational administration, counseling, or school psychology. Approximately 20 percent of these part-time faculty have doctoral degrees, and virtually all of the rest have Master's degrees or special preparation in the areas in which they teach; three-quarters of these part-time faculty have credentials in the areas in which they teach. The Advanced programs depend on part-time faculty for 8-10 course assignments each semester; the balance of the part-time faculty teach in the unit's teacher education programs, including methods courses in the unit's single subject, multiple subject, and special education programs
- As many as 20-25 part-time faculty who are employed to supervise student teachers or interns (6-7 student teachers are equivalent to teaching one 3-unit course) and who are typically credentialed and experienced in the areas in which they supervise
- And a cohort of 20-30 cooperating teachers (approximately 10 in the fall and 20 in the spring) who work with the unit's student teachers as part of the three-person team of student teacher, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor, all of whom are credentialed in the areas in which they teach and have at least three years of successful classroom teaching experience.

As appropriate, therefore, in terms of their academic preparation, professional credentials, and professional experience, the unit has faculty who are well prepared to provide instruction, advisement, and supervision for the unit's candidates in both Initial and Advanced programs.

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Teaching

Based on both written evidence provided in current curriculum vitae, program documents, and course syllabi and on corroborative evidence gathered during interviews with faculty throughout the unit and with unit and University administrators, the following inferences can be drawn about the degree to which faculty in the unit model best practices in their teaching:

- In their own words, virtually all faculty, including many of the unit's part-time and clinical faculty, can articulate the basic principles and tenets of the unit's conceptual framework, and they can explain how the conceptual framework shapes their teaching
- Similarly, virtually all faculty appear to have made the shift from inputs and processes to outcomes, and they appear to understand the importance of candidate performance assessment in the specific courses they teach and in the programs that include these courses
- Both candidates and graduates were able to cite specific examples of unit faculty modeling in their own teaching the kinds of teaching strategies that research supports and advocates, e.g., a candidate who cited how a faculty member teaching about "multiple intelligences" used multiple instructional strategies and assignments to teach this concept
- Faculty in the unit take students' course evaluations very seriously, and they use the data generated by these evaluations to modify their teaching. Similarly, they use peer observations and the resources of the University's Center for Excellence in Teaching to analyze, reflect upon, and improve their teaching
- And the annual evaluation process requires faculty to reflect on their teaching and identify specific ways to improve it during the next year.

Perhaps the most telling indicator of the quality of teaching in the unit is the fact that faculty in the unit are considered to be among the best teachers in the University, their student course evaluations are consistently very high, and they are routinely called upon to conduct sessions for other faculty in the University's Center for Excellence in Teaching.

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Scholarship

In 1994, faculty in the unit made a concerted effort to define expectations for "Scholarly Activities in the School of Education" among tenured and tenure-track faculty, and then, within the past three years, faculty further clarified and reaffirmed these definitions in a document dated January 2000. These expectations and definitions relevant to scholarly activities in the unit are made operational during the hiring of new faculty, the annual evaluation of all faculty, and the more intensive evaluation of faculty involved in probationary, tenure, and promotion reviews.

In the preamble of the January 2000 document, faculty in the unit have clearly related their expectations for scholarship to the mission and goals of both the University and the unit. Quoting from the document:

The primary function of the School of Education at Loyola Marymount University is professional preparation, that is, to prepare students to become effective teachers, counselors, school psychologists, administrators, and educational specialists in bilingual education, reading literacy, and special education....Since our primary mission and emphasis is to enhance service delivery in the schools, the faculty of the School of Education defines scholarly activities as all those activities that not only emphasize traditional basic and applied research activities, but also those activities that have a direct impact on practitioners.

Having made this link between “mission” and “expectations for scholarship,” faculty in the unit then identify three “categories” of scholarship that are acceptable ways of meeting the unit’s mission:

Category 1: Scholarship that reflects direct and/or indirect research, pure, or applied research that is published

Category 2: Applied scholarship that demonstrates involvement with peers, professionals and/or the community which is disseminated to the public

Category 3: Educational scholarship which contributes directly or indirectly to the School of Education faculty member’s growth and competency as well as to the School of Education and University in the field of education.

Of these three categories, the first, which includes refereed or juried publications and presentations, is essential to receiving “top merit” during the annual faculty evaluation process (which determines salary increases), the annual probationary reviews leading up to tenure, and all reviews involving promotion.

As it has been for years, given the traditions of the institution, excellent teaching is expected of all faculty for salary increments, tenure, and advancement in rank, but, increasingly, so too is refereed scholarship. That faculty are responsive to these expectations can be seen in their professional vitae, particularly those of most new faculty. It can also be seen in the summary table (IR, pg. 5.3) of publications and presentations by the unit’s tenured and tenure-track faculty members during the past three years. Between 1999-00 and 2001-02, these 14-15 faculty members published 11 books and more than 50 articles in professional journals (some refereed and others not), and they made nearly 120 presentations at professional conferences.

The one area of scholarship in which they have not been nearly as productive is that of preparing proposals and being awarded both internally and externally funded grants and contracts. During the past four or five years, only half a dozen of the unit’s 14-15 faculty members have submitted proposals to outside funding agencies, including foundations, and only two or three of these proposals have been funded. It has been several years since the unit has seen major funding like that provided by USDOED through a special education personnel preparation grant or a PT-3 technology grant.

Regular full-time faculty in the unit are increasingly involved in scholarship that supports the mission and goals of both the University and the School of Education, and they are increasingly involved in refereed or juried scholarship that goes beyond professional development and service to schools.

Modeling Best Professional Practices in Service

Faculty in the unit clearly model best practice in their professional service on and off campus. This service is described in considerable detail in the IR, in curriculum vitae, and in annual “service reports.” These written descriptions were confirmed in conversations with individual faculty members and with groups of faculty members. Within the School of Education itself, virtually all of the 14 tenured or tenure-track faculty members in the unit serve on multiple program or School committees, as do many of the unit’s current 9 full-time visiting and clinical faculty. Similarly, faculty in the unit provide more than their fair share of service to University committees, and, in recent years, several faculty members in the unit have chaired these University committees.

Membership on University committees runs the gamut from the Graduate Council and the Committee on Excellence in Teaching to the University Planning Council and the new Information Technology Advisory Committee. During the past three years, one faculty member in the unit has chaired the University Research Committee throughout the three years, and others have chaired the University’s Rank and Tenure Committee and its Faculty Senate. Taken in the aggregate, in addition to their extensive program coordinating responsibilities, the unit’s 20-23 full-time faculty members average approximately 40 committee assignments each year within the unit and another 25-30 committee assignments on University committees.

Off campus, virtually all of the unit’s faculty members are involved to one degree or another in their relevant professional organizations at either or both state and national levels. They regularly attend meetings of these groups, review and present papers, serve on committees, participate in initiatives of the organizations, and occasionally serve as officers of these professional associations. In addition, because of their close working relationships with colleagues in K-12 schools (especially Catholic schools), faculty in the unit provide a good deal of direct consultation—some paid, some unpaid—to teachers, administrators, counselors, school psychologists, and other professionals in elementary and secondary schools throughout the Los Angeles metropolitan region.

Collaboration

Central to the unit’s conceptual framework—whether viewed in terms of the four dispositions defined by the acronym REAL or defined in terms of its seven important tenets—a collaborative spirit is endemic to faculty in the unit. They reach out to others, whether students, colleagues on campus, or colleagues in the schools, and they do so in the spirit of “social justice” and with the desire to increase and maximize educational opportunities for all. This collaborative spirit manifests itself in a variety of ways. For instance, given their relatively small size and range of academic programs, faculty work well with each other within program areas and divisions. As described earlier, they serve on multiple committees both within the unit and within the University, and they have established and participate in both formal and informal mechanisms to stimulate and support this collaboration within the University.

For instance, the recently established University Teacher Education Committee serves as a major vehicle for stimulating communication, coordination, and collaboration among all players in teacher education throughout the institution. Chaired by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Committee includes deans, faculty representatives, and staff from offices on campus that serve education students. The Committee, which is now three years old, meets twice a year, and its agendas during the past five or six meetings have included discussion of the mission of the School of Education, its conceptual framework, definition of desired learning outcomes, development of assessment systems, professional dispositions, refinement of the liberal studies major, adaptations required by SB 2042, the evolution of the PLACE Program, and other matters relevant University-wide to teacher education.

A second example of a formal mechanism for stimulating and supporting collaboration within the University is the Special Committee on Math and Science Teacher Preparation, which includes faculty from all relevant disciplines and program areas. On a more informal level, while there is not an established Single Subject or Multiple Subject Teacher Education Committee, the unit's Coordinator of Single Subject Programs and its Coordinator of the Multiple Subject Program keep in regular contact with specialists in the disciplines in three different colleges that are critical to these teacher education programs.

To stimulate and support collaboration within the unit, with others in the University, and with its K-12 community, the unit has several advisory committees—some of which meet sporadically, others of which meet regularly—to share information, talk about critical, current issues, and obtain feedback. These include program advisory committees, a community advisory board, and a dean's advisory board. For similar purposes, the unit sponsors two Saturday meetings each academic year for all regular full- and part-time faculty members.

Finally, as described briefly in the IR (pages 5-5 and 5-6) and detailed in the supporting documentation, the unit is currently involved in eight major collaborative projects or partnerships in K-12 schools. These include Animo Charter High School, BTSA programs for beginning teachers, the Teach for America Program, the Lawndale Partnership, and four projects in Catholic schools, including an inclusion project, the LEAD project, the PLACE project, and a principals development project.

Unit Evaluation of Professional Education Faculty Performance

The unit has several different systems in place to ensure systematic and comprehensive evaluation of both its full-time and part-time faculty, especially with respect to their teaching, but also with respect to the scholarship and service activities of tenured and tenure-track faculty members.

Here is a brief summary of these different systems for evaluating the performance of faculty in the unit:

Regular Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty Members: As soon as they begin their appointment, new tenure-track faculty members are assigned a mentor (a tenured faculty member) who works with the new faculty member regularly throughout his or her probationary period. In addition to serving as “a resource, guide, and confidant for the newly hired faculty member,” the mentor helps the new faculty member understand the unit's expectations for teaching, research, and service, assists in course and syllabus development, observes classes taught by the mentee,

provides guidance as the new faculty member develops his or her research agenda, and guides the new faculty member through both the annual evaluation process and the more elaborate review procedures for annual reappointment and eventual tenure and promotion. This “mentorship program” is described in detail in a document that is given to the mentor and mentee as soon as their relationship begins.

During each of the new faculty member’s first five years in the unit, he or she participates in structured evaluation procedures that include the following steps (completed in April of Year 1 and in late fall in Years 2-5):

- Preparation and submission of a “service report” that addresses the categories of professional activity that will eventually be reviewed for tenure and promotion, especially activities related to teaching, research, and service. This report includes both a narrative and supporting documents, and it gradually builds in size and coverage to become the faculty member’s dossier or portfolio for his or her tenure review
- An opportunity for all tenured faculty in the unit to review the faculty member’s “service report” in light of the expectations of tenure-track faculty members described in the University’s Faculty Handbook
- A meeting of all tenured faculty in the unit with the nontenured faculty member during which the candidate presents his or her report of accomplishments, all other faculty members have a chance to ask questions for clarification and elaboration, and then, in the absence of the candidate, the rest of the faculty members vote on the candidate’s performance to date and on his or her continued appointment in the unit: “Yes,” “Yes, with reservations,” or “No.” The candidate’s faculty mentor prepares the minutes of this meeting, including the vote and any reservations cited, and forwards these minutes to the Dean of the unit
- Preparation by the Dean of an evaluation letter that summarizes his or her assessment of the candidate’s work and is based on review of the candidate’s “service report,” the candidate’s student course evaluations, the minutes of the faculty review of the candidate’s work, and the Dean’s own evaluation of that work
- And finally, a meeting of the Dean with the faculty candidate to review the Dean’s evaluation letter and the Dean’s assessment of the candidate’s strengths and areas for improvement, specifically with respect to teaching, research, and service.

During the first year or two, new faculty members are observed at least once each semester by the Dean, the faculty member’s mentor, and perhaps the coordinator of his or her program, and these classroom observations become part of the faculty member’s personnel record

Finally, during the sixth year, the new faculty member is evaluated for tenure and promotion consistent with University-wide policies and procedures defined in the Faculty Handbook. These include preparation and submission of a cumulative, five-year dossier or portfolio by the candidate, comparable review, discussion, and vote by tenured faculty members in the unit, and preparation by the Dean of a formal letter of assessment and recommendation regarding tenure and promotion. This entire packet of materials is then forwarded to the University Rank and Tenure Committee for review and action.

Throughout these six years of evaluation prior to tenure and promotion, the key documents for making the case are the faculty member's dossier of accomplishments, students' course evaluation data and comments, formal votes by tenured faculty in the unit, and the Dean's independent assessment of performance in the three critical areas of teaching, research, and service.

Visiting Full-Time Nontenure-Track Faculty Members: These individuals are subject to the same thorough evaluation of their teaching by means of students' course evaluations and peer observations, but the follow-up conversations are conducted principally by the unit's Associate Dean (rather than by the Dean) and/or by the faculty member's program coordinator. These faculty members have one-year contracts that can be renewed assuming continued need, funding, and satisfactory performance. Since these faculty members are normally employed for specific purposes and on limited-term projects, their evaluations are closely tied to their specific project roles and responsibilities.

Part-Time Faculty Members: Some of these individuals are employed to teach specific courses, while others are employed to supervise candidates involved in clinical or field experiences in Initial or Advanced programs. When an individual is employed part-time to teach a course for the first time, he or she receives a good deal of guidance, and his or her teaching is closely monitored. Before the semester begins, the program coordinator who employed the part-time faculty member or the faculty member who regularly teaches the course meets with the new part-time faculty member to review the objectives and structure of the course and to assist with development of a course syllabus. By the mid-point of the course, the part-time faculty member is observed by either the coordinator or the regular faculty member and participates in a post-observation conference. In addition, students are asked to complete a mid-term course evaluation, and these results are reviewed, first, by the Dean and, then, by the program coordinator, who meets with the part-time faculty member to provide feedback on his or her teaching and resolve any issues that are affecting the quality of instruction in the course. Then, at the end of the semester, as occurs in all courses in the unit, students are given a second opportunity to evaluate instruction in the course, and these results are used by the Dean, program coordinator and/or faculty member who regularly teaches the course to make decisions on future appointment of the individual to teach the course. If necessary or desirable, this same sequence of activities is followed when the part-time faculty member teaches the course for a second time.

When a individual is appointed part-time to supervise field experiences for the first time, the program coordinator is responsible for ensuring that supervisory responsibilities are clear, that the quality of supervision is assessed, and that evaluative data are formally collected from the candidates who have been supervised, shared with the part-time supervisor, and used to make decisions about future employment.

Cooperating Teachers and Mentor Supervisors: Each program coordinator, who is responsible for identifying cooperating teachers in his or her program area, is also responsible for formally collecting evaluative data from student teachers regarding the effectiveness of their cooperating teachers. These data are shared with the cooperating teachers and used to make decisions about their future involvement in this important role. Because mentor supervisors are employees of school districts, as are the interns whom they mentor, evaluation of the effectiveness of the mentors is controlled more by the employing school districts than by the unit.

In summary, the unit has very thorough criteria and procedures in place for evaluating the teaching, research, and service of tenured and tenure-track faculty, the teaching of part-time faculty, and the supervision provided by full-time clinical supervisors, part-time supervisors, and cooperating teachers. What are not quite as thorough are the criteria and procedures for evaluating the mentors who supervise interns, both of whom are employees of school districts.

Unit Facilitation of Professional Development

Full-time faculty in the unit have multiple opportunities to develop their professional skills as teachers and researchers and to stay abreast of developments in their areas of specialization. Each year, as part of the annual evaluation process, they are expected to reflect on both their accomplishments during the past year and their professional goals for the future, including future work on their research agenda, enhancement of their teaching, and expansion of their service activities on and off campus. These reflections become the basis for developing a personal agenda for professional development for the next year.

The University and the unit provide multiple kinds of support for these professional development activities:

- Thanks to funds available in the unit itself and then matched by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, travel support for attending professional meetings—whether presenting or just attending—and whether at state, national, or international locations is virtually unlimited and substantially more than in other academic units on campus. Total travel funds during the past four years for the approximately 15-20 full-time faculty members in the unit ranged annually between \$30,000 and \$40,000 or an average of \$1,500 to \$2,000 per faculty member
- Both the University and the unit provide multiple programs, workshops, and other kinds of support to help faculty in the unit develop and increase their ability to use technology to support their instruction. For instance, in the spring of 2002, the unit sponsored six technology workshops for faculty on topics ranging from managing class data to SPSS and from qualitative research software to using on-line resources to enrich courses. Participants in these unit-based technology workshops were paid a stipend of \$150 if they attended at least three of the six workshops, and the presenters were paid \$250. Attendance at the six workshops ranged from 8-10 to 18-20, and it totaled more than 80 faculty members. This spring, three additional unit-based technology workshops will be conducted in April. In addition to these unit-based technology workshops, the University's Office of Technology Services regularly provides a multitude of workshops for faculty, staff, and students who wish to increase their technology skills.
- The unit has sponsored both last year and this year two series of workshops for faculty, one series of five Saturday workshops focused on issues of diversity and the other series of two Saturday workshops focused on issues relevant to special education and the needs of students with disabilities.
- The University's Center for Teaching Excellence, which has been in operation for almost a decade now, "sponsors workshops and presentations that support the University's primary goal of achieving academic excellence by enhancing the teaching and learning process." It sponsors course development grants, offers on-line access to three journals devoted to

teaching excellence, maintains a library of print and non-print materials related to improving instruction, and offers videotaping services for faculty who would like to have one of their classes taped for later analysis and reflection

- Finally, the University's Academic Grants Office sponsors eight different University-wide competitions to support faculty research throughout the University. Several of these competitions are especially relevant to faculty in the unit, including two Summer Research Grant Programs (one for new faculty, which is almost guaranteed, and the other for experienced faculty, which is more competitive), two Faith and Justice Grant Programs (one to support research and scholarship and the other to support course development), and a Summer Proposal Development Grant Program to stimulate and support faculty to develop proposals for external funding from public agencies and foundations.

In 2001 and 2002, faculty in the unit received the following number of awards in several of these programs:

	2001	<u>2002</u>
Summer Research Grants for New Faculty	1 of 11	2 of 22
Summer Research Grants for Continuing Faculty	1 of 39	0 of 38
Summer Proposal Development Grants	1 of 4	1 of 4
Faith and Justice Curriculum Development	NA	0 of 5
Faith and Justice Research Grants	NA	0 of 5

None of the rejected proposals in any of these competitions was authored by unit faculty, but, as the data indicate, unit faculty have not taken much advantage of these internal faculty development and research grant opportunities.

There are clearly ample opportunities and supports for faculty development, both within the unit and within the larger University.

Overall Assessment of Standard

Faculty in the unit are well qualified for their instructional, research, and service responsibilities, they model high standards of teaching, scholarship, and service both on and off campus, they collaborate in multiple ways with colleagues in the unit, across the institution, and in K-12 school settings, they have extensive systems in place to monitor and evaluate faculty performance, and they have access to ample professional development opportunities sponsored by both the unit and the University.

C. NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard Met

D. Areas for Improvement: None

E. State Team Decision: Standard Met

STANDARD 6: Unit Governance and Resources

The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

A. Level: Initial and Advanced

B. Findings:

Unit Leadership and Authority

The head of the unit is Fr. Albert Koppes who serves as the Dean of the School of Education. In Spring 2000, the President of LMU, Robert Lawton, approved a change in the unit leadership from director to dean, a change that insured the inclusion of the unit in the university governance structure. With the establishment of the dean's position, the School of Education is represented in university-wide decisions at the level of the Deans' Council and thus directly involved in university-level budget meetings, committee structures, and personnel decisions. In addition to supporting the School of Education in the change of leadership position, the President of LMU has identified the School of Education as one of his five priority areas for university growth and development, and the School of Education's mission, programs, and areas of growth hold a prominent place in the University Strategic Plan.

Charged with delivering and/or coordinating the delivery of all educator programs at the university, the unit works with other colleges across the institution that provide appropriate content knowledge preparation. At the university level, formal mechanisms for collaborative support of the teacher preparation programs include the University Teacher Education Committee and the Committee on Math and Science Teacher Preparation that meet regularly. In addition, curricular changes and other program implementation issues are discussed at the Dean's Council, the Graduate Council, and the Academic Planning and Review Committee, all of which have representatives from the School of Education. The School of Education's secondary education coordinator also facilitates the interactions among colleges who have identified key faculty to interact with and support the teacher education programs. The Academic Vice President who ensures compliance with university policy and regulations administers all academic endeavors at the university.

The School of Education has two divisions. The Teacher Education division is responsible for elementary, secondary, special education, bilingual education, general education, child and adolescent literacy, TESL/multicultural education, bilingual/ bicultural education, as well as the Teach for America and PLACE Corps partnership programs. Professional Services is responsible for School Counseling, School Psychology, and School Administration. A chair heads each division, and key faculty are designated as program coordinators to facilitate the programs. Because of the number of programs in the Teacher Education division, some faculty members coordinate more than one program and/or have extra administrative responsibilities. Additional unit leadership is provided by an associate dean, a unit Advisory Council, and a Council of Coordinators.

Community input is sought through the unit's Community Advisory Board, composed of representatives from the field including master teachers, principals, superintendents, alumni, and

university representatives. The Community Advisory Board serves all programs, meets twice a year, and advises the SOE on programmatic links to the field of education. Through its informal relationships and formal partnerships such as TFA and PLACE programs, the unit supports the educational endeavors of the Los Angeles area school districts. University administrators also consider the SOE as a leader in implementation of the university's mission, in modeling best instructional practices, and in providing outreach to the Los Angeles community at large.

Unit Budget

The establishment of the dean's position has ensured the SOE a voice in budgeting process. Recent data indicate that the SOE budget allocations are at a comparable level to other academic units of similar size. These allocations have steadily increased since the last NCATE visit with particular attention to the area of travel to support not only faculty scholarly activities, but also increased supervision needs due to enrollment increases and partnership initiatives. During the most recent fiscal year, nearly \$40,000 in travel funds has been approved to support the 23 full-time, visiting, and clinical faculty.

The following table lists the overall SOE budget expenditures for the past several years, exclusive of salary. The budget provided by LMU for the partnership programs, PLACE and TFA are listed separately. As terms of these partnerships, these funds must be renewed each year. The PLACE program also received endowments at inception. The Archdiocese provided \$100,000 and the University of Notre Dame provided \$60,000.

SOE Expenditures	Budget Year	PLACE Budgeted	TFA Budgeted
\$116,338	1999-2000	n/a	n/a
\$144,001	2000-2001	<i>[Endowment \$160,000]</i>	\$27,000
\$156,512	2001-2002	\$2,000	\$47,000
\$84,050 <i>[to date]*</i>	2002-2003	\$36,500	\$55,000

* as of January 31, 2003

SOE is seeking further monetary support by submitting various grants with awards of approximately \$110,000 over the past few years. The unit is currently awaiting notification on several grant submissions including an NSF Math/Science Partnership grant proposal for 7.5 million dollars.

Personnel

All tenured and tenure-track faculty within the unit carry a 9-hour teaching load per semester. This load is reduced in instances where responsibilities of coordination or leadership are required. Typically, release time for administrative duties such as division chair or program coordinator is 1 course per semester or year depending upon the size of the program served. Currently, the unit has 14 tenured/tenure-track faculty, six visiting faculty and three clinical faculty to serve 874 candidates, an increase of approximately 50% in the past two years. These faculty members are responsible for instruction, program and curricular planning, coordination of field experiences for candidates in their programs including pre-service and student teaching/internships, and assessment system implementation. Advising loads are mainly handled by the 14 tenured/tenure-track faculty, 5 of these have loads of 50 or more students with the top advising load being 77 students on top of a full teaching load. Three of the six visiting faculty

have advising loads of with the top load of 22 candidates. All three clinical faculty have advising load for TFA and PLACE programs that range from 40 to 89 candidates.

Because of this high advising load for all faculty, adequate monitoring of clinical placements has not always occurred. For example, some TFA candidates and other interns are without mentors in their placements, thus comprising the integrity of the support system for them. This situation is due in part to the fact that the current management system for tracking field placements falls as an additional responsibility for faculty, resulting in a lack of coherence and the ability to quickly access and report data.

These 14 full-time faculty are joined by 21 field supervisors and 34 part-time faculty teaching in initial programs and 9 part-time faculty teaching in advanced programs. Part-time faculty teach between 1 to 2 classes per semester. This use of significant numbers of part-time faculty strains unit resources in that extended efforts must be made to identify, select, train, supervise, and assess part-time faculty to appropriately monitor program quality and coherence. In addition, the over-reliance of part-time faculty negatively impacts the full-time faculty who are responsible for and carry the load of unit and university service on committees and advisement.

The unit will convert three visiting faculty lines to full-time status for the 03-04 academic year and has been promised to receive additional lines being created under the LMU President's initiative to increase faculty lines by 100 over five years so that 80% of courses are taught by a full-time LMU faculty member. However, given the increasing enrollment, planned expansion of the TFA and PLACE initiatives, and the scheduled full implementation of the assessment system, current unit resources in both instructional personnel and professional support to manage the assessment system are strained.

Over the past five years, the unit has increased clerical assistance from three to five and administrative staff from two to five to serve faculty and programs. Faculty and staff indicated that clerical and administrative service had improved since the last NCATE visit.

Unit Facilities

In 2000, the School of Education moved its location from the basement of Sacred Heart Chapel to its new location on the second floor of University Hall, an expansive and well-appointed office complex that was formally the home of the Hughes Aircraft and Raytheon Corporations. This move not only modernized the facilities for the unit, but also more than quadrupled the size, now at close to 20,000 square feet. Faculty offices are spacious, pleasant and functional.

The unit has been able to add two conference rooms, a computer lab, two 25 workstation e-Classrooms, a literacy lab, a two-way video monitoring counseling lab, desk and office space for part-time faculty, faculty-staff workrooms, and graduate student study space. The new location for the School of Education assists candidates in convenient access to the Graduate Admissions Office, Controller's Office, and Career Center. The building contains state-of-the-art *SMART* classrooms, a fitness center, dining hall, coffee shop, student store, adequate office space, and adequate parking.

Unit Resources Including Technology

The unit has an adequate budget for continuing upgrade and integration of learning technologies. LMU uses a university-level Academic Technology Committee to hear budget requests and allocate monies to various units. While the standing operating budget of \$3,000 is limited, the technology budget process involves formal requests for supplemental funds account for the majority of equipment and software purchases each year. These requests include equipment for computer labs including scanners and printers, specialized equipment for areas such as a counseling classroom, faculty computer upgrades, and software. The chart below outlines the supplemental technology allocation for the past few years:

Supplemental Technology Allocations Received: Academic Technology Committee (ATC)	
1999-2000	\$17,340
2000-2001	\$48,000
2001-2002	\$118,000
2002-2003	\$88,400
2003-2004	<i>Pending request \$260,000 – Expected \$130,000</i>

Budget figures provided indicate the SOE has received an equitable amount of university funding for its technology needs. The School has identified an Instructional Technology Director who serves on the SOE Technology Committee and works with individual, small groups, and the whole faculty to better use and infuse technology in the curriculum. The SOE Technology Committee implements the unit's technology plan and serves as a recommending body to the dean.

The library offers a variety of services to support instruction and research efforts including interlibrary loan program, an electronic document delivery program, and access to a variety of other libraries and databases online. Although the library is open 97 hours per week, many faculty choose to use the on-line resources that are accessible from faculty offices via desktop computers or via remote access from home. The library collection is current and balanced between seminal works and current publications. Faculty can also suggest specific titles to support their work.

Overall Assessment of the Standard

The School of Education is the professional education unit, and the Dean serves as the head of the unit. Unit facilities and technology resources have greatly improved over the past five years to support and ever increasing candidate population. However, personnel resources have not kept pace with the increased demands on faculty and professional staff resulting from recent initiatives, increased clinical experiences, and efforts to fully implement a performance assessment system unit-wide. While current plans to convert visiting faculty lines to full time status and university plans to increase the total number of faculty lines provide hope to alleviate heavy faculty loads, the present personnel configuration is inadequate to fully support the unit's goals and objectives.

C. NCATE Team Recommendation: Standard Met

D. Areas for Improvement: New

The unit's current personnel and data management resources are insufficient to support the instructional, advising, clinical, and assessment activities necessary to maintain program quality and coherence.

Rationale: The significant use of part-time faculty for program delivery, high faculty advising loads, increasing candidate enrollment in clinical and field experience, and the need for attention to the full implementation of the unit's performance assessment system indicate the unit's capacity to monitor and support programs and initiatives is at its limit

Previous Weakness Corrected

IV.A. Curriculum decisions regarding content for the Single Subject Credential are made and approved with limited input from the School of Education

Rationale: Improved university level communication structures such as the University Teacher Education Committee and the identification of key personnel in the School of Education and other colleges has resulted in a more collaborative and productive relationship among faculty and administrators who support the teacher education program across all areas of the university.

Previous Weakness Corrected

IV.A. The unit does not have sufficient clerical personnel to support the needs of the unit.

Rationale: Over the past five years, the clerical staff has increased to a level adequate to support the unit

Previous Weakness Corrected

IV.B. The physical facilities of the School of Education do not adequately support the instructional needs of faculty and candidates, or the programs offered.

Rationale: The move of the School of Education from the basement of the Sacred Heart Chapel to a prominent space in University Hall has resulted in an four-fold increase of space and an immediate modernization of facilities. The new space includes outstanding classrooms, computer labs, specialized labs for advance programs in counseling and psychology as well as spacious and well-appointed faculty offices and work spaces.

E. State Team Recommendation: Standard Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns**Internship Issues for State Report :**

Includes Common Standards 1 & 2 – Leadership and Resources, Common Standard 3 – Evaluation, Common Standard 6 – Advice and Assistance, Common Standard 7 – School Collaboration, and Common Standard 8 – District Field Supervisors

All internship issues are sufficiently addressed with the exception that there is an unevenness in the assignment of mentor teachers by the participating districts for the supervision of interns in the teaching credential programs. All internship programs are in the earliest stages of implementation.

PROGRAM STANDARDS

Multiple and Single Subject Credentials Multiple and Single Subject Internship Credentials Multiple and Single Subject BCLAD Emphasis Credentials

Findings on Standards

The reviewers looked critically at the various pathways in place at Loyola Marymount University for obtaining a Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credentials. After reviewing the institutional reports, supporting documents, information gained from interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are fully met with one exception. Standard 16 is met with concerns for both programs.

Program Standard 16 Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors – Met with Concerns

While the team realizes that LMU is currently in a transitional period, moving towards SB2042 implementation, and that the School of Education has experienced a significant rate of growth over the past years, the team found Standard 16, elements a, b, and c are met with concerns. The team found that:

16 (a). Fieldwork sites were not consistently selected according to a well-defined set of criteria that specifically evaluated them as effective in terms of the needs of the candidate.

16 (b). Other than the Verification of Experience and Education Form and informal observation and recommendations, no consistent and specific criteria or rubrics for objectively determining the qualifications of all persons as “exemplary” selections were not evident.

16 (c). No “specific criteria” have been developed as an evaluation instrument for selecting teachers and supervising field experiences.

LMU faculty indicated that such applications and instruments are to be developed for the transition to the SB2042 program. Additionally, faculty indicated that an additional LMU staff person is to be added to insure that a formal process of selection, placement, and evaluation is initiated for all fieldwork assignments.

Strengths

LMU graduates and candidates, without exception, describe all credential programs as a highly positive experience and felt confident and well prepared to respond to their student teaching assignments and curriculum demands. They also indicated they felt a particular strength was the relationship between theory and practice, stipulated by their course materials and assignments. Further, reflective practice is not only required in all areas of study, but subsequently it is carried on after coursework by student teachers and alumni. Students, recognizing the growing need for knowledge and experience with diverse populations, appreciate the continuous infusion of pedagogy and wealth of fieldwork opportunities provided to them throughout their course of study.

LMU candidates commented and hailed LMU faculty for their commitment, inspiration, experience, and support for inquiry, constructivist teaching, and commitment to social justice. Candidates also commented that the School of Education and its faculty are committed to meeting the needs of English Language Learner students as evidenced by an ELD/SDAIE course to be required of all candidates. Students are required to utilize the LMU lesson plan that includes modifications for different learning styles, special needs students and English Language Learner students. A curriculum alignment has also been conducted in all coursework to address the TPE's and in meeting the requirements of special needs students.

Employers and master teachers spoke highly of LMU graduates and student teachers regarding their professionalism and preparation in the content areas. Master teachers commented that they would only accept LMU students as student teachers because of their academic preparation, their training in literacy and technology, and commitment to issues of equity and social justice, strong self-initiative, and taking a leadership role at the school sites.

Adjunct faculty and university supervisors commented on the high level of commitment and support provided by the School of Education by making them feel welcomed and a part of the faculty. They are always given the opportunity to participate in faculty meetings, program and course design, in student teaching seminars and are given feedback regarding their performance.

Overall, a great strength of the LMU program is its commitment to the student as an individual and the willingness to be flexible in designing programs that best fit the needs of the student and the community as a whole.

Concerns:

None Noted

Reading Certificate

Findings on Standards

The team finds that all standards for the Reading Certificate at Loyola Marymount University are fully met. The team's finding is based upon review of the institutional reports and program documents and on interviews with program students, graduates, faculty, school administrators employing graduates.

Strengths

The program is based on a well-articulated sequence of courses and field practices, and prepares experienced teachers to identify and assist struggling readers within their own classroom, become a resource support teacher, or serve as a curriculum leader at their school. With the certificate teachers are well prepared to conduct assessments and develop and implement effective intervention strategies. In addition these teachers are able to provide staff development in reading instruction and interventions based on reading standards, literacy development, and assessments.

Students overwhelmingly praised the program faculty for their knowledge, teaching skill, energy and dedication. Support from faculty members begins in their coursework at LMU and evolves into an ongoing reliable resource for teachers seeking to align and supplement instructional resources, material and programs that exist at their own schools.

The Reading Clinic and its community-tutoring program are a vital component to the certificate program. Not only is the Clinic used during the Practicum Course 626 but also the Clinic's Literacy Resource room, with well-stocked materials, becomes a haven for teachers looking to provide intervention to the struggling readers.

Concerns:

None Noted

Education Specialist Credential: Mild/Moderate Level I
Education Specialist Credential: Mild/Moderate Level I Internship
Education Specialist Credential: Mild/Moderate Level II

Findings on the Standards:

Based on the Institution's responses to the Program Standards, a review of many documents and other items of evidence (assembled in an impressive documents room); and interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, supervising practitioners, University administrators, advisory committee members, university committees, and the credential analyst, the team finds the following: All standards are fully met for the Level I and Level II programs.

The Internship Credential Program has recently been approved by the COA and is scheduled for full implementation in the Fall of 2003. Therefore, no evaluation of the Internship Program could be conducted, beyond observation of the design of the program and a discussion with university and school district personnel regarding the planned implementation. It appears that all the needed components are in place.

Strengths:

The program is small (5-7 graduates per year), but is coordinated by one well qualified faculty member who is supported by qualified part-time faculty who are practitioners from local schools. Collaboration with the Multiple and Single Subject programs is excellent, and there is apparent support from the School Level and University Level administration.

Interviews with candidates, graduates, and employers show highly positive evaluations of the program. Candidates are enthusiastic about their program of professional preparation and indicate a commitment to teaching children/youth who have disabilities. Graduates feel well qualified for their professional positions, and employers are very complimentary of the graduates' knowledge and skills in the classroom.

Relationships between candidates and their faculty advisor seem very positive. They are pleased with the one-to-one attention they receive in instruction and supervision.

Concerns:

Due to the small size of the Education Specialist program at LMU, Program Standards were met or exceeded as a result of informal procedures and efforts by individual faculty members. For example: advisement, program planning, fieldwork placement, and selection of site supervisors oft times depend on informal procedures. While these informal processes are well suited to the small size of the program and the high faculty-to-student ratio, procedures need to be formalized in the event that the Education Specialist program grows, over time, or there is a change in faculty.

Pupil Personnel Service Credential: School Counseling

Findings on Standards:

The Pupil Personnel Services Credential Program with specialization in School Counseling was evaluated according to the standards approved by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Based upon review of program documents and interviews with faculty, students, staff, employers and alumni, the team finds the program meets the program standards with the exception of Program Standard 24 which is met minimally with qualitative concerns. The program has a strong theoretical and conceptual base that is well integrated with field-based experiences.

Program Standard 24: Met minimally with qualitative concerns. Pupil Personnel Services candidates, in particular those candidates from outside of the educational field, receive insufficient instruction in curriculum content and instructional strategies. Lesson plan design and classroom instructional strategies are not sufficiently evident in course syllabi.

Strengths:

The team commends the University for its attention to and leadership in the area of multicultural counseling. The focus on diversity is evident throughout the program. Graduates and candidates mentioned that they felt ready to assist diverse students and families. Employers confirmed that ability to work in and with local communities was a strength of LMU graduates.

Students had high praise of both full-time and part-time faculty for their ability to provide a wealth of theory-based knowledge, as well as practical application of skills in the field. There was strong collaboration between the field and university program which results in candidates who are well prepared to work with community based organizations.

Concerns:

None noted

Pupil Personnel Services Credential: School Psychology Pupil Personnel Services Credential: School Psychology Internship

Findings on Standards:

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation, and the completion of interviews of candidates, graduates, employers, internship supervisors, advisory committee members, full time faculty and local educational agencies, the team has determined that all

program standards for the School Psychology Program are met. Candidates are well prepared for the changes occurring in the field that redefine the role from psychometrist to educational support provider. Candidates understand and there is evidence that they apply the dynamics of consultation, collaboration and team building.

Strengths:

The team commends the University for its attention to and leadership in the area of multicultural counseling. The focus on diversity is evident throughout the program. Graduates and candidates mentioned that they felt ready to assist diverse students and families. Employers confirmed that ability to work in and with local communities was a strength of LMU graduates.

Students had high praise of both full-time and part-time faculty for their ability to provide a wealth of theory-based knowledge, as well as practical application of skills in the field. There was strong collaboration between the field and university program which results in candidates who are well prepared to work with community based organizations.

Concerns:

None noted.

**Preliminary Administrative Services Credential
Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Internship
Professional Administrative Services Credential**

Findings on Standards:

The team examined program documents, supporting documentation, interviewed candidates, program graduates, employers of graduates, part time and full time faculty. The team determined that all program standards for both the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential and the Professional Administrative Services Credential were fully met.

Strengths:

Candidates, graduates and employers all noted that the blend of theory and practice in the program enables them to be ready for their first administrative experiences. The blend of theory and practice helps administrators at the Professional Level become more reflective and refine their leadership skills. Candidates are encouraged to target their leadership on issues of achievement, diversity and social justice both at their school sites and in the surrounding communities.

Concerns:

None noted.

Professional Comments

(These comments and observations from the team are only for the use of the institution. They are to be considered as consultative advice from team members but are not binding on the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.)

Advanced Credential Cluster (PPS and Administration)

In order that both full time and part time faculty, as well as candidates more effectively understand the standards which they are working to reach, the Services Credential cluster may want to cross reference the CTC standards addressed in each course in each syllabus and review them with all candidates and supervisors.

Consideration should be given to meeting with internship site mentors altogether once a semester to review program updates from the faculty.